

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1-21 have been amended, and claim 22 is newly added.

In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner required restriction of the claims to either Invention I, consisting of claims 1-17, or Invention II, consisting of claims 18-21. The Examiner further required restriction of the claims to those corresponding to one of Species A (illustrated in Figures 5-7, 12, 13, 14A-14D), Species B (illustrated in Figure 8), Species C (illustrated in Figure 9), Species D (illustrated in Figure 10) and Species E (illustrated in Figure 11). Upon entry of the present paper, Applicants will have elected, with traverse, claims 1-13, which correspond to Invention I, Species A.

Applicants respectfully request that each of the claims be examined in the instant application, pursuant to the guidelines set forth in M.P.E.P. § 803. That is, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his requirement and find that there would not appear to be “a serious burden” on the office in also examining the claims directed toward the non-elected invention, which would otherwise be withdrawn from consideration if the election requirement is maintained.

Applicants respectfully submit, that in spite of the Examiner’s restriction analysis, the non-elected claims should be examined in the instant application for the following reasons. It would appear that the search for the inventions identified by the Examiner would be coextensive, or at least have significant overlap. For example, one would expect that a

P23922.A02

search for a stator core would include a search of class 29, subclass 596, which contains patents covering methods of making stator cores. Likewise, one would also expect that a search for a method of making a stator core would include a search of class 310, subclass 216, which contains patents covering stator cores. Applicants also submit that the search for each of Species A-E would be highly coextensive since they are differentiated primarily by the engagement structure of the yoke of the stator assembly.

Thus, as the search for the claims of Inventions I and II, and Species A-E are at least partially coextensive, and because there is not a large number of pending claims, there would be no serious burden on the Examiner to examine all of the claims of this application. For this reason, consistent with office policy as set forth in M.P.E.P. § 803, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the Election Requirement. For the foregoing reasons, the Election Requirement in this application is believed improper and it is respectfully submitted that it be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Nevertheless, in order to be fully responsive, Applicants have elected with traverse the invention disclosed in Invention I, Species A, comprising claims 1-13, in the event that the Examiner chooses not to reconsider and withdraw the Restriction Requirement.

Applicants additionally note that in the Restriction Requirement the Examiner asserted that there does not appear to be a generic claim. Applicants respectfully traverse this statement.

Figures 8-11, which the Examiner cited as illustrating alternate species, illustrate

P23922.A02

embodiments of an engagement structure between a connecting part and a yoke of a stator assembly. Independent claim 1 at least, as well as dependent claim 2, do not recite details of the engagement structure, and therefore their scope is not limited to any one embodiment of the engagement structure. Applicants therefore submit that at least claim 1 is a generic claim, and request that the Examiner indicate it as such, should the Examiner choose not to reconsider and withdraw the Restriction Requirement.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Jin-Soo PARK et al.

Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

October 20, 2004
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191